

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Office Action mailed October 1, 2007. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 15 – 27, 29, and 31 – 38 remain pending. In particular, Applicants add claims 35 – 38. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Corrielus spent with Applicants' Attorney, Anthony Bonner, during telephone discussions on January 10, 2008 and January 14, 2008 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During those conversations, Examiner Corrielus and Mr. Bonner discussed potential arguments and amendments with regard to claim 15, in view of the pending claim objection. While no agreement was achieved Applicants respectfully request Examiner Corrielus consider the included amendments and remarks.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicates that claims 26, 27, 29, and 31 are allowed. Applicants sincerely appreciate this indication of allowed subject matter.

III. Claim Objections

The Office Action indicates that claims 15 – 25 are objected to, but would otherwise be allowable if claim 15 were rewritten to overcome the objection. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. More specifically, Applicants submit that the “clock detector” and “the data supervisor” are not necessarily configured as asserted by the Office Action. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that such a configuration is not a requirement of claim 15. As such, Applicants respectfully request removal of this objection.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 – Claim 32 is Allowable Over *Kamoi*

The Office Action indicates that claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,026,098 (“*Kamoi*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Kamoi* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 32. More specifically, claim 32 recites:

A transmission unit, comprising:
a signal integrity supervisor configured to generate a response to a digital data stream having an anomalous condition, the signal integrity supervisor further configured to forward the response to at least one of the following:

***control logic capable of resetting the transmission unit, and
a line driver within the transmission unit, wherein the
response powers down the line driver.***

(Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that *Kamoi* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a “transmission unit, comprising... a signal integrity supervisor configured to... forward the response to at least one of the following... ***control logic capable of resetting the transmission unit...*** [and] ***a line driver within the transmission unit, wherein the response powers down the line driver***” as recited in claim 32, as amended. More specifically, *Kamoi* discloses a “cell frame detector 42 [that] monitors the upstream cascading line to determine if a cell frames signal is being transferred normally and, when an abnormal condition is detected, issues an alarm signal” (column 13, line 14). However, *Kamoi* fails to disclose anything related to forwarding a response to at least one of the following: control logic and a line driver. For at least this reason, claim 32, as amended, is allowable.

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Claims 33 – 34 are Allowable Over *Kamoi* in view of *Buer*

The Office Action indicates that claims 33 – 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,026,098 (“*Kamoi*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,188,257 (“*Buer*”). More specifically, claims 33 – 34 are believed to be allowable over *Kamoi* for at least the reason that these claims depend from claim 32. Because *Buer* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kamoi*, claims 33 – 34 are allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

VI. New Claims 35 – 38 are Allowable

In addition, Applicants add new claims 35 – 38. New claims 35 – 36 are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 15. Claims 37 – 38 are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 32. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/afb/

Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500